

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration of this case and Applicant's proposed claim amendments during the telephone interview on January 25, 2010. Applicant is filing the present RCE because the Examiner indicated in her Interview Summary mailed February 2, 2010 that while Applicant's proposed claim amendments (as recited in Applicant's faxed Interview Request Form dated January 12, 2010) would overcome the current rejections, the proposed amendments would require further search and consideration. Thus, Applicant is filing this RCE and accompanying Amendment/Reply which includes those proposed claim amendments, in order to continue prosecution of the present application. All such amendments are fully supported in the originally filed specification at paragraphs [0024], [0030] – [0033] and [0017] – [0018]. Regarding the amendment to claim 10, it is a well-known physics law that a friction force between an object and a surface depends on a normal force (such as the counterforce (C)) acting on the object. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1 and 3-10 are presently pending the application. In view of the above-described points and the remarks below, the entry of the present amendments, and the favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

**I. Objection to Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because she stated that they fail to show the "at least one operating lever" recited in the claims. As mentioned in Applicant's Interview Request

Form, Applicant has amended all relevant claims to recite only one operating lever as shown in the drawings. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection.

II. Objection to Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 3 because of certain informalities. Applicant has corrected those claims to adopt the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

III. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 10 was rejected as being indefinite because the Examiner stated that the flat face of the cam maintains the opening position, rather than the counterforce (C). Since the Examiner stated after the telephone interview that Applicant's proposed amendment of claim 10 would overcome the current rejection, the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 3-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Nass et al. (WO 03/018939). Since the Examiner stated after the telephone interview that Applicant's proposed amendment of claim 1 would overcome the current rejections (claims 3-10 ultimately depend from and include all of the subject matter of claim 1, which has been deemed

to be allowable at this point), the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejection of all of the presently pending Claims 1 and 3-10, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Should there be any questions or other matters of which resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below. All correspondence should be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: February 22, 2010

By: /Konomi Takeshita/  
KONOMI TAKESHITA  
Reg. No. 38,333

Omori & Yaguchi USA, LLC  
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1300  
1628 John F. Kennedy Boulevard  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 701-6349  
(215) 751-0192 (facsimile)